Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 000–000 (0000) Printed 5 February 2008 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

The GRB early optical flashes from internal shocks: application to GRB990123, GRB041219a and GRB060111b

D. M. Wei[1,2,3]

[1] *Purple Mountain Observatory, Chinese Academy of Science,Nanjing 210008, China.*

[2] *National Astronomical Observatories,Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, 100012, China.*

[3] *Joint Center for Particle Nuclear Physics and Cosmology of Purple Mountain Observatory - Nanjing University, Nanjing 210008,China.*

5 February 2008

arXiv:astro-ph/0605016v2 8 Oct 2006

ABSTRACT

With the successful launch of the Swift Gamma-Ray Burst Explorer, it is widely expected that the prompt optical flashes like GRB990123 would be easily detected. However, the observations show that for a number of GRBs no early optical flash has been detected, which indicates that the reverse shock emission must be suppressed. Here we explore the possibility that the optical flash may arise from the internal shock emission. For GRB990123 and GRB060111b, although their optical emission are not correlated with the gamma-ray emission, we propose here that their optical and gamma-ray emission may arise from different internal shocks (which can be formed by collision of different shells), and find that, under certain circumstances, the optical flashes of GRB990123 and GRB060111b can well be explained by the internal shock model. For GRB041219a, the prompt optical emission was correlated with the gamma-ray emission, which can also be explained by the internal shock model if we assume the optical emission was the low energy extension of the gamma-ray emission, and we find its redshift is about $z \sim 0.2$. As for GRB050904, we have shown in previous paper that the optical flash was produced by synchrotron radiation and the X-ray flare was produced by the synchrotron-self-Compton mechanism. Therefore we conclude that the early optical flashes of GRBs can usually arise from the internal shock emission. Meanwhile in our model since the shells producing the optical flashes would be easily disrupted by other shells, so we suggest that the bright opti-

cal flash should not be common in GRBs. In addition, we also discussed the synchrotron-self-Compton emission in the internal shock model, and find that for different values of parameters, there would be several kinds of high energy emission (at ~ 100 KeV, ~ 10 MeV or GeV) accompanying the optical flash. For a burst like GRB990123, a GeV flare with fluence about 10^{-8} erg cm^{-2} s^{-1} is expected, which might be detected by the GLAST satellite.

Key words: Gamma Rays: bursts−ISM: jets and outflows–radiation mechanisms: nonthermal

1 INTRODUCTION

Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) are the most luminous explosions in the universe, but the origin of their emission is still unclear. With the successful launch of the Swift Gamma-ray Burst Explorer, great progress has been made in the study of the early afterglow of GRBs. The observation of the early afterglow would offer the possibility to clarify the question whether the early emission is from the internal shock or from the reverse shock.

The early optical flash of GRB990123 is widely believed to be produced by the reverse shock emission (Sari & Piran 1999), and it is widespread expected that the prompt optical flash like GRB990123 would be easily detected by Swift. However up to now there are only a few gamma-ray bursts whose prompt optical flashes have been detected contemporaneous with the high energy emission. For GRB990123 and recently discovered GRB060111b, their optical flashes were uncorrelated with the prompt gamma-ray emission, which suggests that the optical emission and gamma-ray emission should have different origin (Akerlof et al. 1999; Kulkarni et al. 1999; Klotz et al. 2006). For GRB041219a, its optical flash was correlated with the gamma-ray emission (Vestrand et al. 2005; Blake et al. 2005), and for GRB050904, a very bright optical flare was temporal coincident with an X-ray flare (Boër et al. 2006), which implies that for these two GRBs there should be a common origin for the optical and high energy emission.

If the reverse shock emission is strong, as expected from the optical flash of GRB990123, then it is naturally to expect that the early optical emission would be easily detected in the Swift era. However, the observations show that for a number of GRBs no early optical emission has been detected, which implies that the reverse shock emission should be significantly suppressed (Roming et al. 2005). Another possibility is that the optical flash may be produced by the internal shock emission. Mészáros & Rees (1999) have shown that the inter-

nal shock model can well explain the temporal behavior of the optical flash of GRB990123. As for GRB050904, Wei et al. (2006) have shown that, within the context of internal shock model, the optical flash was produced by synchrotron radiation, and the X-ray flare was produced by the synchrotron-self-Compton mechanism.

In this paper we will discuss the prompt optical emission and high energy emission based on the internal shock model. For GRB990123 and GRB060111b, their optical emission are uncorrelated with the gamma-ray emission, one possibility is that their optical emission are from the reverse shock, and also there is another possibility: the optical and gamma-ray emission are from the different internal shocks. It is well known that in the internal shock model, the central engine emits a lot of shells with different Lorentz factors, so it is natural that there would be many internal shocks formed by collision of different shells, for example, the gamma-ray emission is produced by the internal shock (S1) which is generated by the collision of shell 1 and shell 2, while the prompt optical emission can be produced by the internal shock (S2) which is generated by the collision of shell 3 and shell 4, in this case the optical emission and the gamma-ray emission is not correlated. In this paper we will show that for GRB990123, GRB060111b and GRB041219a, the observed optical flashes can all be explained by the internal shock model. We also discuss the synchrotron-self-Compton emission in the internal shock model.

2 THE EMISSION FROM THE INTERNAL SHOCK

In the standard fireball model of GRBs, the prompt gamma-ray emission is produced by the internal shock, and the afterglow is produced by the external shock. The internal shock model has been discussed by many authors (e.g. Paczyński & Xu 1994; Daigne & Mochkovitch 1998). In the internal shock model, it is assumed that the central engine emits lots of shells with different Lorentz factors, the fast shell can catch up with the early slow shell and then produce the internal shock.

2.1 The synchrotron radiation of internal shock model

If the typical Lorentz factors of the fast and slow shells are Γ_f and Γ_s respectively, and the fast and slow shells contain about the same masses, then the fast shell will catch up with the slow shell at a radius $R \sim 2\Gamma^2 c\delta t/(1+z)$, where δt is the observed typical variability timescale. The Lorentz factor of the merged shell is $\Gamma \approx \sqrt{\Gamma_f \Gamma_s}$, and the Lorentz factor of

the internal shock can be estimated as $\Gamma_{sh} \approx (\sqrt{\Gamma_f/\Gamma_s} + \sqrt{\Gamma_s/\Gamma_f})/2$ (Piran 1999). Then the thermal energy density of the shocked material is $e \approx 4\Gamma_{sh}(\Gamma_{sh}-1)n_e m_p c^2$ (Blandford & Mckee 1976), where the comoving number density $n_e \simeq L_m/(4\pi\Gamma^2 R^2 m_p c^3)$, L_m is the outflow luminosity and m_p is the rest mass of proton. The strength of magnetic field is $B \simeq 9.3$ G $(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.5})^{1/2}[\Gamma_{sh}(\Gamma_{sh}-1)/2]^{1/2} L_{m,52}^{1/2}(\frac{\Gamma}{600})^{-3}\delta t_1^{-1}(\frac{1+z}{2})$ (Fan & Wei 2005), where ϵ_B is the energy fraction occupied by the magnetic field. Here the convention $Q_x = Q/10^x$ has been adopted in cgs units throughout the text.

As usual, the electrons accelerated by the internal shock would follow the power law distribution $dn_e/d\gamma_e \propto \gamma_e^{-p}$ for $\gamma_e > \gamma_{e,m}$, where $\gamma_{e,m} = \epsilon_e(\Gamma_{sh}-1)[(p-2)m_p]/[(p-1)m_e]$ is the minimum Lorentz factor of shocked electrons (Sari et al. 1998), where ϵ_e is the energy fraction occupied by electrons, m_e is the rest mass of electron. Here we take $p = 2.5$. Then the observed typical frequency of the synchrotron radiation is (Fan & Wei 2005)

$$\nu_m \approx 3.2\times 10^{15}(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.5})^2(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.5})^{1/2}(\Gamma_{sh}-1)^{5/2}(\frac{\Gamma_{sh}}{2})^{1/2} L_{m,52}^{1/2}(\frac{\Gamma}{600})^{-2}\delta t_1^{-1} \text{ Hz} \quad (1)$$

The cooling Lorentz factor is $\gamma_{e,c} \simeq 7.7\times 10^8(1+z)/[(1+Y)\Gamma B^2\delta t]$ (Sari et al. 1998), where $Y = [-1+\sqrt{1+4x\epsilon_e/\epsilon_B}]/2$ is the Compton parameter, $x \simeq min\{1, (\nu_m/\nu_c)^{(p-2)/2}\}$ (Sari & Esin 2001). Then the cooling frequency is

$$\nu_c \approx 5.7\times 10^{15}(\frac{1+z}{2})^{-2}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.5})^{-3/2}[\Gamma_{sh}(\Gamma_{sh}-1)/2]^{-3/2} L_{m,52}^{-3/2}(\frac{\Gamma}{600})^8\delta t_1(1+Y)^{-2} \text{ Hz} \quad (2)$$

The synchrotron-self-absorption frequency is about (Li & Song 2004)

$$\nu_a \approx 2.4\times 10^{14}(\frac{1+z}{2})^{-2/7}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{0.5})^{1/14}[\Gamma_{sh}(\Gamma_{sh}-1)/2]^{1/14} L_{m,52}^{1/14} L_{syn,52}^{2/7}(\frac{\Gamma}{600})^{-8/7}\delta t_1^{-5/7} \text{ Hz} \quad (3)$$

where L_{syn} is the synchrotron radiation luminosity. The maximum flux of synchrotron radiation is $F_{max} \approx 3\sqrt{3}\Phi_p(1+z)N_e m_e c^2\sigma_T\Gamma B/(32\pi^2 q_e D_L^2)$, where q_e is the charge of electron, $N_e = L_m\delta t/[(1+z)\Gamma m_p c^2]$ is the total number of emitting electrons, Φ_P is a function of p, for $p = 2.5$, $\Phi_P = 0.6$ (Wijers & Galama 1999). D_L is the luminosity distance, here we adopt $(\Omega_M, \Omega_\Lambda, h) = (0.3, 0.7, 0.71)$. Using these equations, we can discuss the synchrotron radiation features of GRBs.

2.2 Application to GRB990123, GRB060111b and GRB041219a

Recently we have shown that the optical flash and high energy emission of GRB050904 can be explained by the emission of internal shock (Wei et al. 2006). In this subsection we will discuss whether the synchrotron radiation of internal shock can account for the optical and gamma-ray emission of GRB990123, GRB060111b and GRB041219a.

GRB990123 This is a very strong burst, the isotropic energy of gamma-ray emission was about 3×10^{54} ergs (Andersen et al. 1999; Kulkarni et al. 1999). A well known feature of this GRB is that a very bright optical flash was detected during the prompt gamma-ray emission phase, this is the first time that a prompt emission in another wavelength apart from gamma-rays has been detected from a GRB (Akerlof et al. 1999; Kulkarni et al. 1999). The slope of the power law decay of the optical flash is about -2 up to 10 minutes after the burst, then the flux decayed as $f \propto t^{-1.1}$ which can be ascribed by the emission of external forward shock. The optical flash was not correlated with the gamma-ray emission, which implies they should arise from different regions. Sari & Piran (1999) have shown that the reverse shock emission can explain the optical flash very well. However Mészáros & Rees (1999) have shown that the internal shock model can also explain the temporal behavior of the optical flash. In their model (iii), the outflow was assumed to be magnetic dominated, then the observed optical flux would decay with time as $f_{\nu_{opt}} \propto t^{-p}$ if $\nu_m < \nu_{opt} < \nu_c$ (Mészáros & Rees 1999). So if $p \sim 2$ we can get $f_{\nu_{opt}} \propto t^{-2}$, which is agreement with the observation. However in that paper they only discussed the scaling laws of the temporal behavior, while we need to know whether the prompt optical emission can really be produced by synchrotron radiation of the internal shock.

Using the equations given in the previous section, we find that if we take the parameters as follows: $\Gamma \sim 800$, $L_{m,52} \sim 1$, $\delta t_1 \sim 2$, $\epsilon_e \sim 0.3$, $\epsilon_B \sim 0.5$, then we get $\nu_m \sim 4 \times 10^{14}$ Hz, $\nu_a \sim 5 \times 10^{13}$ Hz, $\nu_c \sim 7 \times 10^{16}$ Hz, $f_{\nu_m} \sim 8.5 \times (\frac{1+z}{2}) D_{L,28}^{-2}$ Jy, for $z = 1.6$, $f_{\nu_m} \sim 1$ Jy, which is quite agreement with the observation. Since $\epsilon_B \sim 0.5$, the outflow is magnetic dominated, and $\nu_m < \nu_{opt} < \nu_c$, so the relation $f_{\nu_{opt}} \propto t^{-p} \propto t^{-2}$ is valid, which is consistent with the observation.

After being accelerated by the shock, all the electrons will cool by adiabatic expansion, so both the ν_m and ν_c will decrease with time as t^{-2} (Mészáros & Rees 1999), then there is a question when will the cooling frequency ν_c cross the optical band? Because we know that if ν_c has crossed the optical band then the optical flux will drop sharply. The optical flash was occurred at about 50 seconds after the burst, and its emission lasted to about 600 seconds. So at 50s the cooling frequency is $\nu_c \sim 7 \times 10^{16}$ Hz, then at 600s $\nu_c \sim 5 \times 10^{14}$ Hz, which is still larger than the optical band. Therefore we conclude that the bright optical flash of GRB990123 can be well explained by the internal shock model.

GRB060111b This was a bright, double-peak gamma-ray burst with duration about 60 seconds, the fluence in the 15-350KeV band was 1.6×10^{-6} ergcm^{-2}. Very recently Klotz et

al. (2006) presented the early optical emission of this GRB, which is the first time that the early optical emission was monitored with a temporal resolution of a few seconds during the prompt high energy emission phase. They reported that from 28s to 80s after the trigger, the optical flux decayed with a slope ~ -2.38, then it was followed by a shallow decay with index ~ -1.08, but if we assume that the optical emission was the superposition of two components, then the slopes of the fast and slow decay become -3 and -0.9 respectively (Klotz et al. 2006). These features are very similar to the case of GRB990123, so we believe the early optical emission of GRB060111b can also be explained by the internal shock model.

At 28s after the trigger, the observed optical emission was about 13.75 magnitude, however, Klotz et al. (2006) pointed out that an extinction of $A_R = 4$ magnitudes was required to reconcile the measured optical flux with the XRT spectrum, so the intrinsic optical flux at 28s was about 0.5 Jy. Since the redshift of GRB060111b is not available, we take $z = 1$. Considering the similarity between this burst and GRB990123, we adopt the same parameters as GRB990123 except L_m, now we take $L_{m,52} = 0.5$, then we obtain $\nu_m \sim 2.8 \times 10^{14}$ Hz, $\nu_a \sim 4.8 \times 10^{13}$ Hz, $\nu_c \sim 2 \times 10^{17}$ Hz, $f_{\nu_{opt}} \sim 2.3(\frac{1+z}{2})D_{L,28}^{-2}$ Jy, for $z = 1$, $f_{\nu_{opt}} \sim 0.5$ Jy, which is quite consistent with the observation.

According to the model (ii) and (iii) of Mészáros & Rees (1999), in the case of $\nu_m < \nu_{opt} < \nu_c$, the flux could decay with time as $F_\nu \propto t^{(1-3p)/2}$ or $F_\nu \propto t^{-p}$, so for the reasonable values of p, the observed optical emission can be well explained by the internal shock model.

GRB041219a This GRB was detected by both the INTEGRAL and Swift satellites. The 15-350KeV fluence was about 1.55×10^{-4} ergs cm^{-2}, placing it among the top few percent of the whole GRB catalog (Vestrand et al. 2005; Blake et al. 2005). It was also one of the longest GRBs with duration about 520 seconds. Between 200-400 seconds one optical flash temporally coincident with the gamma-ray emission was detected. After correcting for the nominal extinction, the peak optical magnitude is about $R_c \sim 13.7$. In contrast to GRB990123, the optical flash of GRB041219a seems to be correlated with the gamma-ray emission, which strongly suggests that they should have the same origin.

One possibility is that the optical flash was produced by the synchrotron radiation of the internal shock, while the gamma-ray emission was produced by the synchrotron-self-Compton process, just as the case of GRB050904 (Wei et al. 2006). However the observation shows that the gamma-ray fluence is much larger than that of the optical emission, $F_\gamma/F_{opt} \sim 10^5$, so if the gamma-ray emission was produced by the SSC process, then the Compton

parameter Y should be about $\sim 10^5$, which is unreasonable large. Therefore it is more likely that the prompt optical emission was the low energy tail of the high energy emission.

The spectral analysis shows that in the range 15-350KeV the slope of the spectra is about -1/2, which implies that ν_c or ν_m should be larger than 350KeV. We find that if $\nu_m > 350$KeV, then the self-absorption frequency ν_a is also very large, then the optical flux would be too low. So the only possible case is $\nu_c > 350$ KeV. If we take the parameters as follows: $\Gamma \sim 1000$, $L_{m,52} \sim 0.1$, $\delta t_1 \sim 0.05$, $\epsilon_e \sim 0.3$, $\epsilon_B \sim 0.02$, then we get $\nu_m \sim 3 \times 10^{14}$ Hz, $\nu_a \sim 10^{15}$ Hz, $\nu_c \sim 7 \times 10^{19}$ Hz, $f_{\nu_m} \sim 27.5 \times (\frac{1+z}{2}) D_{L,28}^{-2}$ mJy. The redshift of GRB041219a is not available, but we find that, in order to account for the observation, its redshift cannot be large. If we take $z \sim 0.2$, then $f_{\nu_m} \sim 275$ mJy, $f(200KeV) \sim 1$ mJy, $f_{\nu_{opt}} = f_m (\frac{\nu_a}{\nu_m})^{-1/2} (\frac{\nu_{opt}}{\nu_a})^{5/2} \sim 10$ mJy, these results are agreement with the observation. We note that both the fluxes in the gamma-rays and optical and the spectral slope are all consistent with the observation. It is interesting to note that Barkov & Bisnovatyi-Kogan (2005) restricted the redshift of GRB041219a as $z \sim 0.12$ by fitting the observed IR afterglow. Very recently McBreen et al. (2006) estimated the pseudo-redshift of this burst and found the lower limit is $z \sim 0.3$.

3 THE SYNCHROTRON-SELF-COMPTON EMISSION OF THE INTERNAL SHOCK

Up to now we only consider the synchrotron radiation in the internal shock, one may ask whether the synchrotron-self-Compton (SSC) process would play an important role in the internal shock model? We'll give a brief discussion on this topic.

If the internal shock is in fast cooling phase, i.e. $\nu_c < \nu_m$, and if ν_m is around the optical band, then the IC scattered photons will peak at $\nu_{m,IC} \sim 2\gamma_{e,m}^2 \nu_m \sim 100$ KeV, and the peak flux of SSC emission is $f(\nu_{m,IC}) \sim Y \nu_m f(\nu_m)/\nu_{m,IC} \sim Y f(\nu_m)/\gamma_{e,m}^2 \sim 10^{-4} f(\nu_m)$ (Y is usually of order unity). We note that at $\nu_{m,IC}$ the SSC emission will exceed the synchrotron emission when $p > 2$. If $f(\nu_m) \sim 50$ mJy, then the IC flux at 1 KeV would be ~ 0.05 mJy, which is just the case of GRB050904 (Boër et al. 2006; Wei et al. 2006). If $\nu_m \sim 1$ KeV, i.e. the synchrotron radiation produced the observed X-ray flare, then the IC scattered photons will peak at $\nu_{m,IC} \sim 2\gamma_{e,m}^2 \nu_m \sim 10$ MeV (see also Wang et al. 2006), the IC peak flux is still $f(\nu_{m,IC}) \sim Y \nu_m f(\nu_m)/\nu_{m,IC} \sim 10^{-4} f(\nu_m)$, then at 100 KeV the IC flux is about $10^{-3} f(\nu_m)$. However at 100 KeV the synchrotron emission flux is $\sim 10^{-p} f(\nu_m)$, so if $p < 3$ (which is

usual the case) then at 100 KeV the IC flux is lower than the synchrotron radiation. The SSC flux will be dominant when $\nu > 10$ MeV. For GRB011121, Piro et al. (2005) reported the detection of a X-ray flare with flux ~ 1 mJy, then we predict there should be a corresponding flare at about 10 MeV with fluence $\sim 10^{-9}$ erg cm^{-2} s^{-1}.

On the other hand, if the internal shock is in slow cooling phase, then from eqs.(1)(2) we find that the Lorentz factor Γ would be very large, for typical parameters Γ should be larger than 500, for example, for GRB990123 we obtain $\Gamma \sim 800$. In this case, the cooling Lorentz factor $\gamma_{e,c}$ is also very large, $\gamma_{e,c} \sim 10^3$. For the case of GRB990123, $\nu_m \sim 10^{14}$ Hz, $\nu_c \sim 5 \times 10^{16}$ Hz, then the peak frequency of SSC is $\nu_{c,IC} \sim 2\gamma_{e,c}^2 \nu_c \sim 1$ GeV, the IC peak flux is $f(\nu_{c,IC}) \sim Y\nu_c f(\nu_c)/\nu_{c,IC} \sim 10^{-6} f(\nu_c)$, while at $\nu_{c,IC}$ the flux of synchrotron emission is $\sim 10^{-3p} f(\nu_c)$, so if $p \sim 2$, then the SSC component is always unimportant. If $p \sim 2.5$, then the SSC component will dominate the synchrotron radiation when $\nu > 1$ MeV. Therefore for the case like GRB990123, we expect there would be a GeV flare with fluence about 10^{-8} erg cm^{-2} s^{-1}, which might be detected by the GLAST satellite.

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The origin of the prompt optical emission contemporaneous with the high energy emission is a very important issue, but it is still unclear. Since the information about the GRB central engine has been lost in the later afterglow, so it is crucial to study the early afterglow and prompt emission. However, for these GRBs with prompt optical emission detected, the relationship between the optical and gamma-ray flux is quite different. For GRB990123and GRB060111b, the optical and gamma-ray emission vary independently, and the optical flux is much higher than the back extrapolation of the late afterglow. For GRB041219a and GRB050904, the optical and high energy emission are correlated, but for GRB041219a it is rather unlikely that the gamma-ray emission is produced by the SSC process, while for GRB050904 the high energy emission can be attributed to the SSC emission (Wei et al. 2006). GRB050401 is another GRB with prompt optical emission detected, its optical emission was uncorrelated with the gamma-ray emission, the most unique feature is that its optical emission can be well fit by the back extrapolation of the late afterglow emission, which suggests that the prompt optical emission may be from the external forward shock emission (Rykoff et al. 2005), so in this paper we did not discuss this burst.

The early optical flash of GRB990123 is widely believed to be produced by the reverse

shock emission(Sari & Piran 1999), and it is suggested that the reverse shock is magnetized (Fan et al. 2002; Zhang et al. 2003). The reverse shock model has also been used to explain some other GRBs (Wei 2003; Zhang et al. 2003; Fan et al. 2005; Shao et al. 2005). If the reverse shock emission is strong like GRB990123, then it is expected that the prompt optical flash would be easily detected by Swift. However, the observations show that for a large fraction of the GRBs no early optical emission has been detected, which implies that the reverse shock emission should be significantly suppressed (Roming et al. 2005). One possibility is that the GRB outflow may be Poynting flux-dominated (Fan et al. 2004; Zhang & Kobayashi 2005).

A different origin for the simultaneous optical flash is that the optical flash may arise from the internal shock emission (Mészáros & Rees 1999; Fan & Wei 2004). Between the time at which the internal shock stops and the time when the outflow is decelerated by the surrounding medium, the bulk Lorentz factor remains approximate constant, hence under some circumstances the emission during this period can account for the observed optical flash. In particular, for a more realistic situation, the average Lorentz factor of the shells could vary. For the case that average Γ increases with time, then a power-law decay of the optical light curve with index ~ 2 can be obtained even for $p > 2$.

It should be noted that the internal shock model is always used to explain the prompt gamma-ray emission, however we note that in the internal shock model, the typical synchrotron radiation frequency strongly depends on the parameters, such as Γ, Γ_{sh}, L_m, δt etc., and for different shocks it is natural that these parameters are different, so we expect that the internal shock model not only can produce the gamma-ray emission, but also can produce the optical or X-ray emission. One good example is that the bright X-ray flares observed in nearly half of the GRBs has been well explained by the late internal shock model (Fan & Wei 2005; Zhang et al. 2006).

Here we discussed the emission features of optical flash based on the standard internal shock model, and found that the observations can be well explained by the internal shock model. We found that for these GRBs with optical flash, the values of δt and Γ are usually larger than that of the typical GRBs. For typical GRBs $\delta t \sim 10^{-2}$ s and $\Gamma \sim 300$. We suggest this may explain why the optical flashes like GRB990123 have not been observed for a number of GRBs, this is because in order to produce the optical flash, the time interval between the two shells should be large, while in this case the shells would be easily disrupted by other shells, so only those survived shells can collide to produce the optical flash. If this

is true, then we expect the bright optical flash like GRB990123 should not be common in GRBs.

In the internal shock model, the value of δt should be determined by the physical processes which powered the gamma-ray burst. However up to now the explosion mechanism is still unclear, so the value of δt cannot be obtained theoretically. But fortunately, the value of δt can be estimated from the observed light curve, since δt reflects the typical variability timescale of the light curve. From observations we note that the variability timescale of optical flash is much longer than that of gamma-ray emission, so it is quite reasonable that δt of optical flash is much longer than that of gamma-ray emission.

We also discuss the synchrotron-self-Compton process in the internal shock model, we have shown that there are several possibilities depending on the values of parameters. In the fast cooling case, if ν_m is around the optical band, then there would be a flare occurred at ~ 100 KeV. If $\nu_m \sim 1$ KeV, i.e. the X-ray flare observed in many GRBs, then the SSC emission will be dominant at the frequency $\nu \sim 10$ MeV. While in the slowing cooling case, since Γ is very large, there would be a GeV flare accompanying the optical flash, and for GRB990123 a GeV flare with fluence about 10^{-8} erg cm^{-2} s^{-1} is expected, which might be detected by the GLAST satellite. The more details on the synchrotron-self-Compoton emission accompanying the optical flashes needs numerical calculation, and we will give a detailed numerical calculation in a subsequent paper.

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank the referee for her/his helpful comments. I thank Y.Z. Fan for helpful discussions. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation (grants 10225314 and 10233010) of China, and the National 973 Project on Fundamental Researches of China (NKBRSF G19990754).

REFERENCES

Akerlof, C. et al. 1999, Nature, 398, 400

Andersen, M.I., et al., 1999, Science, 283, 2075

Barkov, M.V., Bisnovatyi-Kogan, G.S., 2005, astro-ph/0503414

Blake, C. H., et al. 2005, Nature, 435, 181

Blandford, R.D., Mckee, C.F., 1976, Phys. Fluids, 19, 1130

Boër, M., et al., 2006, ApJ, 638, L71

Daigne, F., Mochkovitch, R., 1998, MNRAS, 296, 275

Fan, Y. Z., Dai, Z. G., Huang, Y. F., & Lu, T. 2002, Chin. J. Astron. Astrophys. 2, 449

Fan, Y. Z., & Wei, D. M. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 292

Fan, Y. Z., & Wei, D. M. 2005, MNRAS, 364, L42

Fan, Y. Z., Wei, D. M., & Wang, C. F. 2004, A&A, 424, 477

Fan, Y. Z., Zhang, B., & Wei, D. M. 2005, ApJ, 628, L25

Klotz, A., et al., 2006, astro-ph/0604061

Kulkarni, S., et al., 1999, Nature, 398, 389

Li, Z., & Song, L. M. 2004, ApJ, 608, L17

McBreen, S., et al., 2006, astro-ph/0604455

Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 1999, MNRAS, 306, L39

Paczynski, B., Xu, G.H., 1994, ApJ, 427, 708

Piran, T., 1999, Phys. Rep., 314, 575

Piro L. et al., 2005, ApJ, 623, 314

Roming, P., et al., 2005, astro-ph/0509273

Rykoff, E.S., et al., 2005, ApJ, 631, L121

Sari, R., Piran, T., Narayan, R., 1998, ApJ, 497, L17

Sari, R., & Piran, T. 1999, ApJ, 517, L109

Sari R., Esin A. A. 2001, ApJ, 548, 787

Shao, L., & Dai, Z. G. 2005, ApJ, 633, 1027

Vestrand, W. T. et al. 2005, Nature, 435, 178

Wang, X.Y., Li, Z., Mészáros, 2006, ApJ, 641, L89

Wei, D. M. 2003, A&A, 402, L9

Wei, D.M., Yan, T., Fan, Y.Z., 2006, ApJ, 636, L69

Wijers, R. A. M. J., & Galama, T. J. 1999, ApJ, 523, 177

Zhang, B., Kobayashi, S., & Mészáros, P. 2003, ApJ, 595, 950

Zhang, B., Kobayashi, S., 2005, ApJ, 628, 315

Zhang, B., et al., 2006, ApJ, 642, 354